



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/162,933	10/30/98	REITMEIER	9 SAR13070

TM02/0116
THOMASON, MOSER AND PATTERSON, LLP
2-40 BRIDGE AVENUE
P.O. BOX 8160
RED BANK NJ 07701-5300

EXAMINER

MEISLAHN, D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2132

DATE MAILED:

01/16/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Interview Summary

Application No.
09/182,933

Applicant(s)
Reitmeier et al.

Examiner
Douglas Meislahn

Group Art Unit
2132



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Douglas Meislahn

(3) _____

(2) Peter Kendell

(4) _____

Date of Interview Jan 9, 2001

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to applicant applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 14

Identification of prior art discussed:

Walker et al. and Inoue

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

The examiner indicated that the independent claim included four widely known, compatible computer process and requested that applicant narrow the claim. Claim 14 was perused as a potential panacea for the independent claims. Newly cited Lyons et al. should be studied with respect to claim 14, specifically columns six and seven. Applicant's intended but unclaimed randomness with respect to the index would probably be met by the abstract of the new reference Katta et al.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.

[Signature]
TOD SWANN
SUPERVISOR PTO AT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER-100